1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT							
2	FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA							
3								
4	SYNGENTA CROP PROTECTION, LLC							
5	Plaintiff							
6	vs. CIVIL ACTION NO:							
7	WILLOWOOD, LLC, et al. 1:15-CV-274							
8	Defendants							
9	/							
10								
11	***ATTORNEY'S EYE'S ONLY***							
12								
13	The Videodeposition of JOSEPH M.D.							
14	FORTUNAK, Ph.D. was held on Monday, October 10, 2016,							
15	commencing at 9:00 a.m., at Kirkland & Ellis, LLP, 655							
16	15th Street, N.W., Suite 1200, Washington D.C. 20005,							
17	before Christina Essi Pagano, Notary Public.							
18								
19								
20								
21	Reported By: Christina Essi Pagano, RPR							

202

1 Q And that would teach away from the 2 combining them all together, correct?

A It would teach away from combining them together or from the use of methoxide ion --

Q Okay.

A -- in that esterification step.

MR. TILLER: Why don't we take a quick

8 break.

3

4

6

7

9 VIDEOGRAPHER: We're now going off the

10 record. The time 3:03.

11 (There was a recess taken.)

12 VIDEOGRAPHER: We are now back on the

13 record. The time is 3:20.

MR. TILLER: Doctor, thank you. I have no

15 further questions.

16 CROSS EXAMINATION BY MS. BALTZER:

17 Q Dr. Fortunak, I'm going to ask you some

18 questions in followup to the questioning that

19 Mr. Tiller did today.

You mentioned earlier that, in response to

21 Mr. Tiller's questioning, that the presence of DABCO

related impurities indicated that DABCO found Azoxy 2SC came from azoxystrobin technical as opposed to other ingredients that were in Azoxy 2SC. Do you remember that?

A Yes, I do.

2.0

Q And what is the significance of the presence of DABCO related impurities that was found in Azoxy 2SC?

A Well, there could always be a bit of a kind of a -- kind of a miniscule worry about, did DABCO somehow get into this from the other ingredients that went into the Azoxy 2SC. And looking at those ingredients, it's really -- the likelihood is very, very small. It's -- but if we actually look at DABCO plus the two related impurities, what we see is that the DABCO reacted with one of the partners, one of the reacting molecules that otherwise would've undergone the condensation step to make azoxystrobin. And so if that's the case, then we would have to say that both the DABCO and an intermediate were making azoxystrobin, was present in one of the -- in some of the adjuvants

somehow, and that is -- that's so unlikely that it's essentially, vanishingly possible.

- Q So the testing that you reviewed that Syngenta did, finding that there were these DABCO related impurities in Willowood's Azoxy 2SC, what did that -- how did that inform your analysis of whether Willowood practices the '761 patent?
- A Well, it reinforces the idea that DABCO is present because it shows us that the DABCO that was present was present at the time when azoxystrobin was actually being synthesized.
- Q And in what part of the Azoxy 2SC would that DABCO have been found in?
- A In the final stage that we've all agreed is the condensation step.
- Q What molecule within Azoxy 2SC would that DABCO have been found in, based on the fact that there were DABCO related impurities found in Azoxy 2SC?
- A Okay. It would react with intermediates when you're in the final stage. The stage, I think it's probably called stage four, that condensation

stage when azoxystrobin itself is formed	ı	stage	when	azoxy	ystrobin	itself	is	formed
------------------------------------------	---	-------	------	-------	----------	--------	----	--------

- Q And so in the final product after it was formulated into Azoxy 2SC, what part of that Azoxy 2SC would the DABCO have come from, based on the fact that there were DABCO related impurities in the Azoxy 2SC?
 - A From the azoxystrobin technical.
- Q You talked with Mr. Tiller a little earlier about the Weintritt reference; do you remember that?
 - A Yes.
- Q Have you made any legal determinations as to whether the Weintritt references prior art?
- 12 MR. TILLER: Objection.
- THE WITNESS: No. I'm not a legal expert.

14 BY MS. BALTZER:

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

15

16

17

- Q When you were discussing Weintritt in your rebuttal expert report, why did you refer to the examples in Weintritt?
- A So it's the difference between a patent
 that's directed towards making compounds for a specific
 purpose, for instance, for testing. If you want to
 make a lot of different compounds and that's your